

REMARKS

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 -22

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,421,709 issued to McCormick et al. (*McCormick*) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0132006 issued to Horvitz et al. (*Horvitz*). Applicant submits claims 1-22 are not obvious in view of *McCormick* and *Horvitz* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 recites, in part, the following:

enabling configuration of a plurality of automatic response email messages, at least one of which is tailored for an incoming email message having a first internal mail type and at least another of which is tailored for an incoming email message having an external mail type;

Independent claims 8 and 15 recite similar limitations. The Examiner correctly concedes *McCormick* does not disclose enabling configuration of a plurality of automatic response email messages, each of which is tailored for a type of incoming email message. Furthermore, *McCormick* does not distinguish incoming email messages as either internal (e.g., internal corporate) mail messages or external (e.g., non-corporate) mail messages. The Examiner relies on *Horvitz* as disclosing a plurality of automatic response messages. Regardless of whether *Horvitz* discloses a plurality of response messages, *Horvitz* does not disclose a plurality of response messages, at least one of which is tailored for an incoming email message having a first internal mail type and at least another of which is tailored for an incoming email message having an external mail type, as claimed by Applicant. *Horvitz* does not expressly or inherently disclose a distinction between internal (e.g., corporate) email messages and external (e.g., non-corporate) email

messages. Thus, Applicant submits *Horvitz* fails to cure the deficiencies of *McCormick*. Accordingly, Applicant submits claims 1, 8 and 15 are not obvious in view of *Horvitz* and *McCormick*.

Applicant submits that the dependent claims are non-obvious for at least the same reasons claims 1, 8 and 15 are not obvious. Applicant further submits the dependent claims include additional features that are, in and of themselves, distinguishable over the prior art of record. For example, claim 6 recites a method according to claim 1 wherein the internal mail type comprises at least one of a plurality of defined internal organizations. In other words, a different automated response email is sent based on the internal organization from which an email is received. The cited portion of *McCormick* fails to distinguish an incoming email based on whether it is an internal email or an external email. As such, *McCormick* necessarily fails to disclose distinguishing an internal organization type from within an internal email. This is simply one example illustrating the deficiencies of *McCormick* and *Horvitz* with respect to the dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-22 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: October 10, 2008

/Jared S. Engstrom/
Jared S. Engstrom
Reg. No. 58,330
Attorney for Applicant

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

Date: October 10, 2008

/Katherine Jennings/
Katherine Jennings